

### REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for the thorough consideration given the present application. Claims 1, 2, 5, 7, 11, 12, 17, 18 and 20-30 are currently being prosecuted. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider his rejections in view of the Amendments and Remarks as set forth hereinbelow.

### ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating claims 10-15 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form and that dependent claim 16 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection of 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, set forth in this Office Action and to be in independent form. In light of this indication, claim 1 has been amended to include the subject matter recited in dependent claims 4 and 10 and claim 11 has been rewritten in independent form. Further, independent claim 20 has also been amended to include subject matter similar to that recited in dependent claim 11. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted independent claims 1, 11 and 20 and each of the claims depending therefrom are allowable and that the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Ishii et al. is moot.

### CLAIM FOR PRIORITY

It is gratefully acknowledged that the Examiner has recognized the Applicants' claim for foreign priority. Because the Applicants' claim for foreign priority has been perfected, no additional action is required from the Applicants at this time.

### DRAWINGS

It is gratefully acknowledged that the Examiner has approved the Formal Drawings submitted by the Applicants. The drawings comply with the requirements of the USPTO. No further action is necessary.

### ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

The Examiner has acknowledged the previously filed Information Disclosure Statement. An initialed copy of the PTO-1449 has been received from the Examiner. No further action is necessary at this time.

### OBJECTION TO THE ABSTRACT

Further, the Abstract has been amended at line 8 as suggested by the Examiner. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested the objection to the Abstract be withdrawn.

### REJECTION UNDER 35 USC 112

Claim 16 stands rejected under 35 USC 112. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Dependent claim 12 has been amended to depend on claim 11 and therefore has proper antecedent basis for the term "shock absorber." Accordingly, it is respectfully requested this rejection be withdrawn.

### NEW CLAIMS

In addition, new claims 20-30 have been added to set forth the invention in a varying scope, and Applicants submit the new claims are supported by the originally filed specification. In particular, new claim 20 is supported at least by Figure 4 and the corresponding description in the specification. In more detail, independent claim 21 includes a combination of elements described in dependent claims 4, 7 and 11 regarding the engine support system, the front assembly and the rear suspension support system. Note, that the rear suspension support system assembly does not recite that the pair of left and right rear suspension support systems closed loop structures form a triangular shape. Rather, this has been added as dependent claim 22.

It is respectfully submitted the features recited in new independent claim 21 are not taught or suggested in the cited references. For example, none of the references teach or suggest a combination of the specific elements recited regarding the engine support system, the front assembly and the rear suspension support system as claimed.

Further, new independent claim 26 is a combination of original claims 1, 3 and 4. These features are supported at least by Figure 4 and the corresponding description in the specification. For example, Figure 4 illustrates the engine support system assembly 73 including a pair of left and right engine support system closed loop structures 77L and 77R connected by an engine support system cross member 28. It is respectfully noted none of the applied art teach or suggest these features. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted claims 26-30 are also allowable.

### CONCLUSION

In view of the above remarks, it is believed that the claims clearly distinguish over the patents relied on by the Examiner, either alone or in combination.

Since the remaining patents cited by the Examiner have not been utilized to reject the claims, but to merely show the state of the art, no comment need be made with respect thereto.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration of the rejections and allowance of all of the claims are respectfully requested.

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (703) 205-8000 in the Washington, D.C. area.

A prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment is respectfully requested.

Application No. 10/815,754  
Amendment dated November 30, 2006  
Reply to Office Action of August 30, 2006

Docket No.: 0649-1005PUS1

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37.C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.14; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: November 30, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

James M. Slattery

Registration No.: 28,380

*for* BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant